arXiv:1411.6218

Age Problem in Lemaître-Tolman-Bondi Void Models

Xiao-Peng Yan,[1,*] De-Zi Liu,[2] and Hao Wei[1,†]

[1]*School of Physics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, China*
[2]*Department of Astronomy, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

arXiv:1411.6218v3 [gr-qc] 3 Feb 2015

ABSTRACT

As is well known, one can explain the current cosmic acceleration by considering an inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic universe (which violates the cosmological principle), without invoking dark energy or modified gravity. The well-known one of this kind of models is the so-called Lemaître-Tolman-Bondi (LTB) void model, in which the universe is spherically symmetric and radially inhomogeneous, and we are living in a locally underdense void centered nearby our location. In the present work, we test various LTB void models with some old high redshift objects (OHROs). Obviously, the universe cannot be younger than its constituents. We find that an unusually large r_0 (characterizing the size of the void) is required to accommodate these OHROs in LTB void models. There is a serious tension between this unusually large r_0 and the much smaller r_0 inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on). However, if we instead consider the lowest limit 1.7 Gyr for the quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$, this tension could be greatly alleviated.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k, 95.36.+x, 98.80.Es, 98.65.Dx

* email address: 764644314@qq.com
† Corresponding author; email address: haowei@bit.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of the current accelerated expansion of the universe [1–6], various models have been proposed to explain this mysterious phenomenon. As is well known, the modern cosmology is based on general relativity and the cosmological principle. The well-known Einstein field equations read

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} \,,$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ are the Einstein tensor and the stress-energy tensor respectively, and we set the speed of light $c = 1$ throughout this work. According to the pillars of modern cosmology, these theoretical models can be categorized into the following three major types.

The first one is to modify the right hand side of Einstein field equations. That is, one can introduce an exotic energy component, namely dark energy with negative pressure [7–9], while general relativity still holds. The simplest candidate of dark energy is a tiny cosmological constant [10, 11] introduced by Einstein himself in 1917. As is well known, it seriously suffers from the fine-turning problem and the cosmological coincidence problem [11–14]. To alleviate these problems, various dynamical models of dark energy were proposed, such as quintessence [15–17], phantom [18, 19], k-essence [20–22], quintom [23], Chaplygin gas [24, 25], vector-like dark energy [26–28], holographic dark energy [29], (new) agegraphic dark energy [30–32], hessence [33, 34], spinor dark energy [35–37], and so on.

The second one is to modify the left hand side of Einstein field equations, namely to modify general relativity on cosmological scale. Einstein's general relativity is checked to hold in the range from large scales like the solar system to small scales in the order of millimeter. However, there is no *a priori* reason to believe that general relativity cannot be modified on cosmological scales. In the literature, various modified gravity theories were proposed to account for the cosmic acceleration, for instance, $f(R)$ theory [38–40], scalar-tensor theory [40, 41], Dvali-Gabadadze-Porrati (DGP) model [42–44], Galileon gravity [45–47], Gauss-Bonnet gravity [48, 49], $f(T)$ theory [50, 51], massive gravity [52–54].

The third one is to give up the cosmological principle, and consider an inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic universe, without invoking dark energy or modified gravity. As a tenet, the cosmological principle is known to be partly satisfied on large scales. However, it has not been proven on cosmic scales $\gtrsim 1\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ [55]. Obviously, our local universe is inhomogeneous and anisotropic on small scales. On the other hand, the nearby sample has been examined for evidence of a local "Hubble Bubble" [56]. It is reasonable to imagine that we are living in a locally underdense void. If the cosmological principle is relaxed, it is possible to explain the apparent cosmic acceleration in terms of a peculiar distribution of matter centered upon our location [57–64]. In the literature, the cosmological principle has been tested by using e.g. type Ia supernovae (SNIa) [57, 65, 135], cosmic microwave background (CMB) [55, 66–71, 130], time drift of cosmological redshifts [72, 129], baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) [73–75], integrated Sachs-Wolfe effect [76], galaxy surveys [77], kinetic Sunyaev Zel'dovich effect [78–80, 131, 134], observational $H(z)$ data [81, 82], gamma-ray bursts [83], growth of large-scale structure [132], and so on. It is found that the violation of cosmological principle can be consistent with most of these observations (in fact few observations slightly favor the violation of cosmological principle). Therefore, it is reasonable to consider an inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic universe. In the literature, the well-known models violating cosmological principle are the so-called Lemaître-Tolman-Bondi (LTB) void models [84–86]. In LTB void models, the universe is spherically symmetric and radially inhomogeneous, and we are living in a locally underdense void centered nearby our location. The Hubble diagram inferred from lines-of-sight originating at the center of the void might be misinterpreted to indicate cosmic acceleration. In fact, LTB void models can be consistent with (even slightly favored by) the observations mentioned above.

In the present work, we try to test LTB void models with the age of the universe. Obviously, the universe cannot be younger than its constituents. In history, the age problem played an important role in cosmology for many times. However, we should clarify the two meanings of age problem. The first meaning is that the total age of the universe (namely the age measured at present day, or, redshift $z = 0$) cannot be smaller than the age of the oldest known objects (e.g. globular clusters, galaxies, quasars) in our universe. Historically, the matter-dominated Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) model without cosmological constant can be ruled out [87] because its total age is smaller than the ages inferred from old globular clusters, unless the Hubble constant is extremely low or the universe is extremely open. In the literature, one might consider a variant of this type of age problem. For instance, the authors of [88, 89] reconstructed LTB model from ΛCDM model by requiring they share the same expansion

history (luminosity distance, light-cone mass density, angular diameter distance $d_A(z)$, Hubble parameter $H(z)$), and found that the total age of the universe inferred from LTB model is much smaller than the one inferred from ΛCDM model ($t_{\Lambda\rm CDM} - t_{\rm LTB} \sim 2.4\,{\rm Gyr}$). However, strictly speaking, this variant of age problem is not the real age problem, since LTB model is the reconstructed one, and the total age of the universe is not compared with the real age of old objects (e.g. globular clusters, galaxies, quasars). So, we do not consider this kind of age problem in the present work.

Instead, here we consider the second meaning of age problem, namely the age of the universe at any high redshift $z > 0$ (rather than the total age at present day, $z = 0$) cannot be younger than its constituents at the same redshift. Obviously, in this case the age problem becomes more serious than the first one. There are some old high redshift objects (OHROs) considered extensively in the literature, for instance, the 3.5 Gyr old galaxy LBDS 53W091 at redshift $z = 1.55$ [90, 91], the 4.0 Gyr old galaxy LBDS 53W069 at redshift $z = 1.43$ [92]. In addition, the old quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$ [93, 94] is also used extensively. Its age is estimated to be 2.0 – 3.0 Gyr [93, 94]. In [95], by using a different method, its age is reevaluated to be 2.1 Gyr. To assure the robustness of our analysis, we use the most conservative lower age estimate 2.0 Gyr for the old quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$ throughout the present work. In the literature, these three OHROs have been extensively used to test various dark energy models (see e.g. [87, 95–102]) and modified gravity models (see e.g. [103–107]). In the present work, we will use them to test various LTB void models.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly review the main points of LTB model. In Sec. III, we test various LTB void models with OHROs. In Sec. IV, we discuss the possibility to alleviate the age problem. In Sec. V, we give the brief conclusion and discussion.

II. THE LTB MODEL

In the LTB void model, the universe is spherically symmetric and radially inhomogeneous, and we are living in a locally underdense void centered nearby our location. The dynamic of a spherically symmetric dust universe is described by the LTB solution to Einstein field equations. It was firstly proposed by Lemaître [84], then was further discussed by Tolman [85] and Bondi [86]. The LTB metric, in comoving coordinates (r, θ, ϕ) and synchronous time t, is given by [84–86] (see also e.g. [81, 82, 110, 133])

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + \frac{A'^2(r,t)}{1-k(r)}\,dr^2 + A^2(r,t)\,d\Omega^2\,, \tag{1}$$

where $d\Omega^2 = d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta\,d\phi^2$; a prime denotes a derivative with respect to r, and $k(r)$ is an arbitrary function of r, playing the role of spatial curvature. Note that it reduces to the well-known FRW metric if $A(r,t) = a(t)\,r$ and $k(r) = kr^2$. The stress-energy tensor of the mass source is given by

$$T^{\nu}_{\mu} = -\rho_{_M}(r,t)\,\delta^{\nu}_{0}\,\delta^{0}_{\mu}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho_{_M}$ is the energy density of dust matter. The Einstein field equations read [82, 108–110, 115]

$$H_{\perp}^2 + 2H_{\perp}H_{\parallel} + \frac{k(r)}{A^2} + \frac{k'(r)}{AA'} = 8\pi G\rho_{_M}\,, \tag{3}$$

$$\dot{A}^2 + 2A\ddot{A} + k(r) = 0\,, \tag{4}$$

where a dot denotes a derivative with respect to t, and

$$H_{\perp}(r,t) \equiv \frac{\dot{A}(r,t)}{A(r,t)}\,, \tag{5}$$

$$H_{\parallel}(r,t) \equiv \frac{\dot{A}'(r,t)}{A'(r,t)}\,, \tag{6}$$

are the expansion rates at the transverse and longitudinal directions, respectively. Integrating Eq. (4), we obtain [108–110, 113–115]

$$\dot{A}^2(r,t) = \frac{2M(r)}{A(r,t)} - k(r)\,, \tag{7}$$

where $M(r)$ is an arbitrary function (the factor 2 is introduced just for convenience; one should be aware of the different symbol conventions in the relevant references). If $M(r)$ and $k(r)$ are given, one can obtain $A(r,t)$ by directly solving Eq. (7). For convenience, we instead try to find the parametric solutions for it. Following e.g. [111–114], we recast Eq. (7) as

$$\frac{\dot{A}^2(r,t)}{|k(r)|} = -\tilde{k} + \frac{2M(r)}{A(r,t)\,|k(r)|}\,, \tag{8}$$

to normalize $\tilde{k} \equiv k(r)/|k(r)| = +1, -1, 0$ for $k(r) > 0$, $k(r) < 0$, $k(r) = 0$, respectively. The solutions of Eq. (8) can be written implicitly in terms of an auxiliary variable η as [111]

$$A(r,t) = \frac{M(r)}{|k(r)|}\frac{ds(\eta)}{d\eta}\,, \quad \text{with} \quad t - t_B(r) = \frac{M(r)\,s(\eta)}{|k(r)|^{3/2}}\,, \tag{9}$$

where $t_B(r)$ is actually a "constant" of integration. Therefore, Eq. (8) becomes an ordinary differential equation of the function $s(\eta)$,

$$\left[\frac{d^2 s(\eta)}{d\eta^2}\right]^2 = -\tilde{k}\left[\frac{ds(\eta)}{d\eta}\right]^2 + 2\,\frac{ds(\eta)}{d\eta}\,, \tag{10}$$

whose solutions are given by [111]

$$s(\eta) = \begin{cases} \eta - \sin\eta & \text{for} \quad \tilde{k} = +1\,, \\ \sinh\eta - \eta & \text{for} \quad \tilde{k} = -1\,, \\ \eta^3/6 & \text{for} \quad \tilde{k} = 0\,. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Substituting Eq. (11) into Eq. (9), the parametric solutions of Eq. (7) read (see e.g. [82, 110, 112–114])

$$A(r,t) = \frac{M(r)}{k(r)}(1-\cosh\eta)\,, \quad t - t_B(r) = \frac{M(r)}{[-k(r)]^{3/2}}\,(\sinh\eta - \eta) \quad \text{for} \quad k(r) < 0\,, \tag{12}$$

$$A(r,t) = \frac{M(r)}{k(r)}(1-\cos\eta)\,, \quad t - t_B(r) = \frac{M(r)}{[k(r)]^{3/2}}\,(\eta - \sin\eta) \quad \text{for} \quad k(r) > 0\,, \tag{13}$$

$$A(r,t) = \left[\frac{9M(r)}{2}\right]^{1/3}[t - t_B(r)]^{2/3} \quad \text{for} \quad k(r) = 0\,, \tag{14}$$

where $t_B(r)$ is an arbitrary function of r, usually interpreted as the "bang time" due to singularity behavior at $t = t_B$. Substituting Eq. (7) into Eq. (3), we have [108–110, 113–115]

$$\frac{2M'(r)}{A'A^2} = 8\pi G\rho_{_M}\,. \tag{15}$$

Considering Eq. (7) at the present day ($t = t_0$), it can be recast as

$$1 = \frac{2M(r)}{H_{\perp 0}^2(r)A_0(r)^3} - \frac{k(r)}{H_{\perp 0}^2(r)A_0(r)^2} \equiv \Omega_M(r) + \Omega_K(r)\,, \tag{16}$$

where the subscript "0" indicates the present value of corresponding quantity, i.e., $A_0(r) = A(r, t = t_0)$, $H_{\perp 0}(r) = H_\perp(r, t = t_0)$. Therefore, we can parameterize the functions $M(r)$ and $k(r)$ as [108–110]

$$2M(r) = H_{\perp 0}^2(r)\,\Omega_M(r)\,A_0^3(r)\,, \tag{17}$$

$$-k(r) = H_{\perp 0}^2(r)\,\Omega_K(r)\,A_0^2(r)\,, \tag{18}$$

where $\Omega_K(r) = 1 - \Omega_M(r)$. Noting Eq. (15), it is easy to see that Ω_M and Ω_K defined in Eqs. (17) and (18) can reduce to the present fractional densities of FRW cosmology if $A(r,t) = a(t)\,r$ and $k(r) = kr^2$ while

$H_{\perp 0}$ and Ω_M are spatially homogeneous. So, the above parameterizations are justified. Substituting Eqs. (17), (18) into Eqs. (12)—(14), we obtain the total cosmic age as a function of r [82], namely

$$t_0 - t_B(r) = \frac{\mathcal{F}(\Omega_M)}{H_{\perp 0}(r)}\,, \tag{19}$$

in which the function $\mathcal{F}(x)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{F}(x) \equiv \begin{cases} \dfrac{-\sqrt{x-1} + x \sin^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{x-1}{x}}}{(x-1)^{3/2}} & \text{for} \quad x > 1\,, \\ 2/3 & \text{for} \quad x = 1\,, \\ \dfrac{\sqrt{1-x} - x \sinh^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{1-x}{x}}}{(1-x)^{3/2}} & \text{for} \quad x < 1\,. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Furthermore, to compare our theoretical models with observations, we need to associate the coordinates with redshift z. For an observer located at the center $r = 0$, by symmetry, incoming light travels along radial null geodesics, $ds^2 = d\Omega^2 = 0$, and hence we have [110]

$$\frac{dt}{dr} = -\frac{A'(r,t)}{\sqrt{1-k(r)}}\,, \tag{21}$$

where the minus sign is due to $dt/dr < 0$, namely time decreases when going away. Together with the redshift equation [108–110, 115]

$$\frac{d\ln(1+z)}{dr} = \frac{\dot{A}'(r,t)}{\sqrt{1-k(r)}}\,, \tag{22}$$

we can write a parametric set of differential equations [110]

$$\frac{dt}{d\ln(1+z)} = -\frac{A'(r,t)}{\dot{A}'(r,t)}\,, \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{dr}{d\ln(1+z)} = \frac{\sqrt{1-k(r)}}{\dot{A}'(r,t)}\,. \tag{24}$$

Once the functions $\Omega_M(r)$ and $H_{\perp 0}(r)$ characterizing LTB model are given, substituting Eqs. (17) and (18) into Eq. (7), the scale function $A(r,t)$ can be found by solving the resulting differential equation. Then, one can obtain $t(z)$ and $r(z)$ as functions of redshift z from Eqs. (23) and (24) with the initial conditions $r(z=0) = 0$ and $t(z=0) = t_0$. Note that in solving Eq. (7), the parametric solutions given in Eqs. (12)—(14) are useful. One can do this numerically using a modified version of the code easyLTB [110] (see e.g. [82] for a brief technical illustration; however, one should be careful of the typos in [82], and the different symbol conventions in the relevant references, e.g. [82, 108–110, 112–115], as well as the difference between the relevant references and the code easyLTB [110]). It is worth noting that the present scale function $A_0(r) = A(r, t = t_0)$ of LTB model can be chosen to be any smooth and invertible positive function. Following [82, 108–110], we choose the conventional gauge $A_0(r) = A(r, t = t_0) = r$, which actually corresponds to set the present scale factor $a_0 = a(t = t_0) = 1$ in FRW cosmology.

III. TESTING VARIOUS LTB VOID MODELS WITH OHROS

In the LTB void models, we are living at a special space point, which is close to the center of a large local underdense region of the universe [84–86, 115–117]. At very large distances from the observer, the inhomogeneous LTB region goes to an external FRW space. Obviously, it violates the Copernican



FIG. 1: The 3D plot of the allowed parameter space of the Gaussian model for (a) OHRO at $z = 1.43$, (b) OHRO at $z = 1.55$, (c) OHRO at $z = 3.91$, respectively. The blue contours indicate the model parameters making the theoretical cosmic age equal to the age of OHRO at the same redshift. The allowed parameter spaces are the upper regions of these contours. Note that r_0 is in units of Gpc. See the text for details.

principle that states we do not occupy any special place in the universe. In the literature, it is found that the LTB void models can be consistent with (even slightly favored by) various observations mentioned in Sec. I. Here, we try to test various LTB void models with three OHROs mentioned in Sec. I, namely the 3.5 Gyr old galaxy LBDS 53W091 at redshift $z = 1.55$ [90, 91], the 4.0 Gyr old galaxy LBDS 53W069 at redshift $z = 1.43$ [92], and the 2.0 Gyr old quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$ [93, 94].

A. The Gaussian model

The gradient in the bang time $t_B(r)$ corresponds to a currently non-vanishing decaying mode [118, 119], which might imply an inhomogeneous early universe that violates inflation, and lead to inhomogeneities in the galaxy formation time. To be simple, one might assume that the big bang is spatially homogeneous, namely t_B is a constant. Following e.g. [82, 110], we can set $t_B = 0$ for convenience. In this case, Eq. (19) becomes

$$H_{\perp 0}(r) = H_0 \mathcal{F}(\Omega_M)\,, \tag{25}$$

where the function $\mathcal{F}$ is given in Eq. (20), and

$$H_0 \equiv 1/t_0\,. \tag{26}$$

So, in this case, one only needs to specify $\Omega_M(r)$, and then $H_{\perp 0}(r)$ can be found from Eq. (25).

At first, we consider the simplest Gaussian LTB void model [65, 82], in which the matter density function $\Omega_M(r)$ has a Gaussian profile, namely

$$\Omega_M(r) = 1 + (\Omega_{in} - 1)\,\exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2r_0^2}\right)\,, \tag{27}$$

where Ω_{in} is the matter density at the center of the void, and r_0 describes the size of the void. In this work, we only consider the case of $\Omega_{in} < 1$. From Eq. (25), it is easy to obtain

$$H_{\perp 0}(r) = H_0 \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_K(r)} - \Omega_M(r)\sinh^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_K(r)}{\Omega_M(r)}}}{[\Omega_K(r)]^{3/2}}\,, \tag{28}$$

where $\Omega_K(r) = 1 - \Omega_M(r)$, and H_0 actually plays the role of Hubble constant. So, there are three free model parameters, namely Ω_{in}, r_0, and h (which is the Hubble constant H_0 in units of 100 km/s/Mpc).

To test the Gaussian model with the three OHROs at redshift $z = 1.43$, 1.55, 3.91, we scan a fairly wide parameter space $0.01 \leq \Omega_{in} \leq 0.99$, 1.0 Gpc $\leq r_0 \leq$ 501.0 Gpc, and $0.4 \leq h \leq 1.0$. At every point, we numerically calculate the theoretical cosmic age at redshift $z = 1.43$, 1.55, 3.91 for the Gaussian model with the corresponding parameters Ω_{in}, r_0, and h. Then, we obtain three contours which indicate the model parameters making the theoretical cosmic age equal to the age of OHRO at the same redshift $z = 1.43$, 1.55, 3.91. We present them in Fig. 1. Only the parameters corresponding to a theoretical cosmic age larger than (or equal to) the age of OHRO at the same redshift are allowed. In fact, the allowed parameter spaces are the upper regions of the contours shown in Fig. 1. From Fig. 1, it is easy



FIG. 2: The 2D plot of the allowed parameter space of the Gaussian model with fixed $h = 0.738$ (black contour lines), 0.673 (red contour lines), 0.623 (green contour lines) for OHROs at $z = 1.43$ (solid contour lines), $z = 1.55$ (dashed contour lines), $z = 3.91$ (dash-dotted contour lines), respectively. The contour lines indicate the model parameters making the theoretical cosmic age equal to the age of OHRO at the same redshift. The allowed parameter spaces are the upper regions of these contour lines. Note that r_0 is in units of Gpc. See the text for details.



FIG. 3: Cosmic age as function of redshift z for the parameter space $0.01 \leq \Omega_{in} \leq 0.99$, $0.1\,\mathrm{Gpc} \leq r_0 \leq 25\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ of the Gaussian model with fixed $h = 0.738$ (cyan), 0.673 (red), 0.623 (green). The three OHROs at redshift $z = 1.43$, 1.55, 3.91 are also indicated by black stars. See the text for details.

to see that a large r_0 is required to accommodate the three OHROs. In particular, from the panel (c) of Fig. 1, we find that $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at redshift $z = 3.91$. To see this clearer, in Fig. 2 we show the 2D slices of the allowed parameter space with fixed $h = 0.738$, 0.673, 0.623. Note that $h = 0.738$ is the best-fit value of the Hubble constant from SHOES SNIa project [120]; $h = 0.673$ is the one from Planck CMB data [121]. On the other hand, Sandage *et al.* advocated a lower Hubble constant from HST SNIa, and the best-fit value of their final result is $h = 0.623$ [122]. The allowed parameter spaces are the upper regions of the contour lines in Fig. 2. Note that the absence of green-solid contour line in Fig. 2 means that the entire plotted parameter space of the Gaussian model with a fixed $h = 0.623$ is allowed for OHRO at $z = 1.43$. This fact can be seen clearly from Fig. 3, in which we scan the parameter space $0.01 \leq \Omega_{in} \leq 0.99$, $0.1\,\mathrm{Gpc} \leq r_0 \leq 25\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ with fixed $h = 0.738$, 0.673, 0.623, and plot cosmic age as function of redshift z. It is clear that OHRO at $z = 1.43$ is below the lower boundary of the green region, and hence all the parameter space is allowed in this case. Similarly, the absence of red-dashed and green-dashed contour lines in Fig. 2 means that the entire plotted parameter space of the Gaussian model with fixed $h = 0.673$, 0.623 is allowed for OHRO at $z = 1.55$, and it can also be seen clearly from Fig. 3, since OHRO at $z = 1.55$ is below the lower boundaries of both the red and green regions. On the other hand, from Fig. 3, one can also see that at least $r_0 > 25\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$, since it is above all the upper boundaries of the cyan, red, and green regions. In fact, from the small panel in Fig. 2, at least $r_0 > 30\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$. The unusually large r_0 brings a serious crisis to the Gaussian LTB void model. As is well known, the Hubble radius (Hubble horizon) $H_0^{-1} \simeq 3.0\,h^{-1}\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ [123] characterizes the size of our observable universe. The size of the void should be much larger than the size of our observable universe to accommodate OHROs (see the discussion in Sec. V however). On the other hand, there is a serious tension between this unusually large r_0 and the much lower r_0 of order $1.0\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on) mentioned in Sec. I. If the Gaussian LTB void model can be consistent with other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on), it cannot accommodate OHROs. Of course, it is known that the lower Hubble constant, the larger cosmic age is. However, as shown in the panel (c) of Fig. 1, $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is still required even for a very low $h = 0.4$. So, this serious crisis cannot be alleviated with a lower Hubble constant.



FIG. 4: The same as in Fig. 1, except for the CGBH model with a fixed $h = 0.673$, and (a) OHRO at $z = 1.43$, (b) OHRO at $z = 3.91$. See the text for details.

B. The CGBH model

Next, we consider a simplified version of the so-called Garcia-Bellido-Haugbølle (GBH) model [110], namely the constrained GBH (CGBH) model [110] (see also e.g. [82]). In CGBH model, one also assumes that the big bang is spatially homogeneous, namely t_B is a constant which can be set to zero. So, Eq. (25) is valid in the CGBH model. The matter density function $\Omega_M(r)$ is given by [110] (see also e.g. [82])

$$\Omega_M(r) = 1 + (\Omega_{in} - 1)\left\{\frac{1 - \tanh[(r - r_0)/2\Delta r]}{1 + \tanh(r_0/2\Delta r)}\right\}, \tag{29}$$

where Ω_{in} is the matter density at the center of the void; r_0 describes the size of the void; Δr characterizes the transition to uniformity. In this work, we only consider the case of $\Omega_{in} < 1$. From Eq. (25), we get

$$H_{\perp 0}(r) = H_0 \frac{\sqrt{\Omega_K(r)} - \Omega_M(r)\sinh^{-1}\sqrt{\frac{\Omega_K(r)}{\Omega_M(r)}}}{[\Omega_K(r)]^{3/2}}, \tag{30}$$

where $\Omega_K(r) = 1 - \Omega_M(r)$, and H_0 actually plays the role of Hubble constant. So, there are four free model parameters, namely Ω_{in}, r_0, h (which is the Hubble constant H_0 in units of 100 km/s/Mpc), and $\delta r \equiv \Delta r/r_0$ (which is equivalent to Δr in fact).

Similar to the previous subsection, we firstly scan the full parameter space to test this model with OHROs. However, since there are four free parameters in the CGBH model, it is difficult to plot a 4D parameter space. Instead, we consider the 3D plot of the allowed parameter space of the CGBH model with a fixed $h = 0.673$ coming from Planck CMB data [121], and we present it in Fig. 4. Note that the wide parameter ranges we scanned are $0.01 \leq \Omega_{in} \leq 0.99$, $1.0\,\mathrm{Gpc} \leq r_0 \leq 501.0\,\mathrm{Gpc}$, and $0.1 \leq \delta r \leq 0.9$. The absence of plot for OHRO at redshift $z = 1.55$ in Fig. 4 means that the entire plotted parameter space of the CGBH model with a fixed $h = 0.673$ is allowed for OHRO at $z = 1.55$. This can be seen clearly from Fig. 5 in which OHRO at $z = 1.55$ is below the lower boundary of the red region, and hence the entire parameter space is allowed in this case. Note that from the panel (b) in Fig. 4, a large $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$. Also, in Fig. 6 we show the 2D slices of the allowed parameter space with fixed $h = 0.623$, 0.673, 0.738, and $\delta r = 0.40$, 0.64, 0.80. Note that



FIG. 5: The same as in Fig. 3, except for the CGBH model with an additional parameter $0.2 \leq \delta r \leq 0.9$. See the text for details.

$\delta r = 0.64$ is the best-fit value from SNIa, CMB and BAO [110], and $\delta r = 0.40$ and 0.80 are close to the edges of its 2σ confidence region. The absence of the contour lines for OHROs at $z = 1.43$ and 1.55 in the left panel of Fig. 6 means that the entire plotted parameter space of the CGBH model with a fixed $h = 0.623$ is allowed for these two OHROs. And the absence of the contour lines for OHRO at $z = 1.55$ in the middle panel of Fig. 6 means that the entire plotted parameter space of the CGBH model with a fixed $h = 0.673$ is allowed for OHRO at $z = 1.55$. This can be seen clearly from Fig. 5 in which OHRO at $z = 1.43$ is below the lower boundary of the green region, and OHRO at $z = 1.55$ is below the lower boundaries of both the red and green regions. From the three small panels of Fig. 6 and the panel (b) of Fig. 4, we see that at least $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$. Therefore, the same crisis also exists in the CGBH model. Again, the size of the void should be much larger than the size of our observable universe (characterized by the Hubble radius/horizon $H_0^{-1} \simeq 3.0\,h^{-1}\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ [123]) to accommodate OHROs (see the discussion in Sec. V however). On the other hand, there is a serious tension between this unusually large $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ and the much lower r_0 of order 1.0 Gpc inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on) mentioned in Sec. I. If the CGBH LTB void model can be consistent with other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on), it cannot accommodate OHROs.

C. The GBH model

Finally, we consider the original version of GBH model [110], in which one does not assume that the big bang is spatially homogeneous. Therefore, Eqs. (25) and (26) are invalid, and hence $\Omega_M(r)$ and $H_{\perp 0}(r)$ should be specified independently. In GBH model, they are given by [110]

$$\Omega_M(r) = \Omega_{out} + (\Omega_{in} - \Omega_{out}) \left\{ \frac{1 - \tanh[(r - r_0)/2\Delta r]}{1 + \tanh(r_0/2\Delta r)} \right\}, \tag{31}$$

$$H_{\perp 0}(r) = H_{out} + (H_{in} - H_{out}) \left\{ \frac{1 - \tanh[(r - r_0)/2\Delta r]}{1 + \tanh(r_0/2\Delta r)} \right\}, \tag{32}$$



FIG. 6: The same as in Fig. 2, except for the CGBH model with fixed $h = 0.623$ (left panel), 0.673 (middle panel), 0.738 (right panel), and $\delta r = 0.40$ (green contour lines), 0.64 (red contour lines), 0.80 (black contour lines), for OHROs at $z = 1.43$ (solid contour lines), $z = 1.55$ (dashed contour lines), $z = 3.91$ (dash-dotted contour lines). See the text for details.

where Ω_{out} is the asymptotic value of the matter density; Ω_{in} is the matter density at the center of the void; H_{out} and H_{in} describe the Hubble expansion rate outside and inside the void, respectively; r_0 describes the size of the void; Δr characterizes the transition to uniformity. Following [110], we fix $\Omega_{out} = 1$. So, there are five free model parameters, namely Ω_{in}, r_0, $\delta r \equiv \Delta r/r_0$ (which is equivalent to Δr in fact), h_{in} and h_{out} (which are H_{in} and H_{out} in units of 100 km/s/Mpc).

Similar to the previous subsections, we try to scan the full parameter space to test this model with OHROs. However, since there are five free parameters in the GBH model, it is very difficult to plot a 5D parameter space. Instead, in Fig. 7 we show the 2D slices of the allowed parameter space with fixed $h_{in} = 0.50, 0.58, 0.70$, and $h_{out} = 0.60, 0.49, 0.40$, as well as $\delta r = 0.40, 0.62, 0.80$. Note that $h_{in} = 0.58$, $h_{out} = 0.49$, $\delta r = 0.62$ are the best-fit values from SNIa, CMB and BAO [110], and we appropriately vary these parameters to see their effect on the allowed parameter space. From Fig. 7, it is easy to see that the parameters δr and h_{out} have fairly minor effects on the allowed parameter space. On the other hand, comparing the three columns of Fig. 7, we find that the parameter h_{in} plays a considerable role. The smaller h_{in}, the wider parameter space can be allowed. From the middle and right columns of Fig. 7 (especially from the small panels), it is easy to see that for $h_{in} \gtrsim 0.58$, a large $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ is required to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$. In this case, as in the previous two LTB void models, the serious crisis also exists in the GBH LTB void model. That is, the size of the void should be much larger than the size of our observable universe to accommodate OHROs (see the discussion in Sec. V however); there exists a serious tension between this unusually large $r_0 > 10\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ and the much lower r_0 of order 1.0 Gpc inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on) mentioned in Sec. I. However, for a very low $h_{in} = 0.50$, the required r_0 can be in a lower range $\sim 4 - 6\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ to accommodate OHROs, as shown in the left column of Fig. 7. Note that the Hubble radius/horizon $H_0^{-1} \simeq 3.0\,h^{-1}\,\mathrm{Gpc} \sim 6\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ for a very low $h \sim 0.50$. So, in this case, it is possible to accommodate OHROs while the size of the void is smaller than the size of our observable universe. However, if we further consider the constraints from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on), the situation becomes subtle. In [110], the best-fit parameters with 2σ uncertainties from SNIa, CMB and BAO are given by $h_{in} = 0.58 \pm 0.03$, $h_{out} = 0.49 \pm 0.2$, $\Omega_{in} = 0.13 \pm 0.06$, $r_0 = 2.3 \pm 0.9\,\mathrm{Gpc}$, $\delta r = 0.62 \pm (> 0.20)$. There exists still a remarkable tension far beyond 2σ between OHROs and other observations, because $h_{in} = 0.50$ and $r_0 \sim 4 - 6\,\mathrm{Gpc}$ can be excluded by other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and BAO) far beyond 2σ regions. Even worse, the effect

of h_{in} is in contrast to the one of r_0 actually. If we increase h_{in}, the required r_0 to accommodate OHRO at $z = 3.91$ will increase correspondingly, as shown in Fig. 7. Therefore, it is very difficult to conciliate both h_{in} and r_0 with the higher $h_{in} = 0.58 \pm 0.03$ and the smaller $r_0 = 2.3 \pm 0.9$ inferred from SNIa, CMB and BAO [110] at the same time. We are in a dilemma. The tension between the constraints from OHROs and other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on) is fairly serious. So, the age problem cannot be completely alleviated in the GBH LTB void model, although it is in a situation slightly better than the Gaussian model and the CGBH model (but at the price of having more model parameters).



FIG. 7: The same as in Fig. 2, except for the GBH model with fixed $h_{in} = 0.50$ (left column), 0.58 (middle column), 0.70 (right column), $h_{out} = 0.60$ (top row), 0.49 (middle row), 0.40 (bottom row), $\delta r = 0.40$ (black contour lines), 0.62 (red contour lines), 0.80 (green contour lines), for OHROs at $z = 1.43$ (solid contour lines), $z = 1.55$ (dashed contour lines), $z = 3.91$ (dash-dotted contour lines). See the text for details.



FIG. 8: The same as in Fig. 1 (left panel) and Fig. 2 (right panel), except only for OHRO at $z = 3.91$ whose age has been changed to 1.7 Gyr. See the text for details.

IV. ALLEVIATING THE AGE PROBLEM

In the previous section, it is easy to find that the age problem in three LTB void models is mainly due to the OHRO at $z = 3.91$. In fact, this OHRO has ruled out (at least brought trouble to) most cosmological models (see e.g. [87, 95–107]), including the well-known concordance ΛCDM model. Naturally, one might doubt on the validity of this quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$ (we thank the referee for pointing out this issue). In fact, its age was estimated model-dependently. In [94], the age 2.0 – 3.0 Gyr was obtained by using the giant elliptical model (M4a) and the extreme model (M6a), which are two of 12 chemical evolution models considered in [128]. In [98], its age was re-evaluated following [128]. They found the age of APM 08279+5255 *since the initial star formation and stellar evolution in the galaxy*: (1) the best estimated value is 2.1 Gyr; (2) 1σ lower limit is 1.8 Gyr; (3) the lowest limit is 1.5 Gyr (although this is highly improbable as noted in [98]). However, this is not the age since the beginning of the universe, because the initial star formation started about 0.2 – 0.3 Gyr after the big bang. Therefore, in [98] they concluded the age of APM 08279+5255 *since the beginning of the universe*: (1) the best estimated value is 2.3 Gyr; (2) 1σ lower limit is 2.0 Gyr; (3) the lowest limit is 1.7 Gyr (although this is highly improbable as noted in [98]).

In the previous section, we used the age 2.0 Gyr for APM 08279+5255 at $z = 3.91$, which is just the 1σ lower limit given in [98]. Here, we would like to consider the lowest limit 1.7 Gyr [98], and see whether the age problem can be alleviated. Because the age problem is most serious in the Gaussian LTB void model as mentioned above, and not to break the length limit, we only consider the Gaussian model here. In Fig. 8, we show the 3D plot and the 2D slices of the allowed parameter space of the Gaussian model only for OHRO at $z = 3.91$ whose age has been changed to 1.7 Gyr. Although $r_0 \gtrsim 20$ Gpc is still required for $h > 0.623$ (see the right panel of Fig. 8), we find from the left panel of Fig. 8 that r_0 can reach ~ 5 Gpc for a lower $h \lesssim 0.55$. In this case, $r_0 \sim 5$ Gpc to accommodate OHROs can be slightly smaller than the Hubble radius/horizon $H_0^{-1} \simeq 3.0\,h^{-1}$ Gpc [123]. However, $r_0 \sim 5$ Gpc is still larger than the one of order 1.0 Gpc inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on) mentioned in Sec. I, the tension still exists. Nevertheless, comparing with the previous section, it is fair to say that the tension has been greatly soften and the age problem is alleviated in some sense.



FIG. 9: Cosmic age as function of redshift z for the parameter space (a) $0.5 \leq h \leq 0.8$, $0.25 \leq \Omega_{m0} \leq 0.45$ (green) and (b) $0.661 \leq h \leq 0.685$, $0.298 \leq \Omega_{m0} \leq 0.332$ (red) of the flat ΛCDM model. The three OHROs at redshift $z = 1.43$, 1.55, 3.91 are also indicated by black stars. Note that the age of OHRO at $z = 3.91$ has been changed to 1.7 Gyr. See the text for details.

Since the age 2.0 Gyr for APM 08279+5255 at $z = 3.91$ has also ruled out most cosmological models including ΛCDM model, it is of interest to see whether the age problem can also be alleviated in ΛCDM model, if the age of APM 08279+5255 is changed to the lowest limit 1.7 Gyr [98]. For the flat ΛCDM model, its age at redshift z is given by [87, 96, 99, 123]

$$T(z) = \int_z^\infty \frac{d\tilde{z}}{(1+\tilde{z})H(\tilde{z})}\,, \quad \text{where} \quad H(z) = H_0\sqrt{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_{m0})}\,. \tag{33}$$

There are two free parameters, namely Ω_{m0} and h (the Hubble constant H_0 in units of 100 km/s/Mpc). In Fig. 9, we scan the parameter space (a) $0.5 \leq h \leq 0.8$, $0.25 \leq \Omega_{m0} \leq 0.45$ and (b) $0.661 \leq h \leq 0.685$, $0.298 \leq \Omega_{m0} \leq 0.332$, and plot cosmic age as function of redshift z. Note that the latter (b) is in fact the 1σ region from Planck CMB data [121], namely $h = 0.673 \pm 0.012$, $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315 \pm 0.017$. From Fig. 9, we see that all the three OHROs can be well accommodated in ΛCDM model for the wide parameter space (a), since the cosmic age can be larger than the ones of all OHROs. Even for the narrow parameter space (b), OHRO at $z = 3.91$ is just on the edge. Clearly, the age problem can also be alleviated in ΛCDM model if the age of APM 08279+5255 is changed to the lowest limit 1.7 Gyr.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

As is well known, one can explain the current cosmic acceleration by considering an inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic universe (which violates the cosmological principle), without invoking dark energy or modified gravity. The well-known one of this kind of models is the so-called Lemaître-Tolman-Bondi (LTB) void model, in which the universe is spherically symmetric and radially inhomogeneous, and we are living in a locally underdense void centered nearby our location. In the present work, we test various LTB void models with some old high redshift objects (OHROs). Obviously, the universe cannot be younger than its constituents. We find that an unusually large r_0 (characterizing the size of the void) is required to accommodate these OHROs in LTB void models. There is a serious tension between this unusually large r_0 and the much smaller r_0 inferred from other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on). However,

if we instead consider the lowest limit 1.7 Gyr for the quasar APM 08279+5255 at redshift $z = 3.91$, this tension could be greatly alleviated.

It is worth noting that in addition to the three OHROs used in this work, there are other OHROs in the literature, for instance, the 4.0 Gyr old radio galaxy 3C 65 at $z = 1.175$ [124], and the high redshift quasar B1422+231 at $z = 3.62$ whose best-fit age is 1.5 Gyr with a lower bound of 1.3 Gyr [125]. However, they cannot be used to constrain the models as restrictive as the three OHROs used in this work. So, we do not consider them here. On the other hand, 9 extremely old globular clusters in M31 galaxy [126, 127] were considered in [102]. Note that their ages are estimated to be in the range $14 - 16$ Gyr [126, 127], which is much larger than the total age of the universe ~ 13.8 Gyr inferred from the CMB observations (e.g. WMAP [4] and Planck [121]). Of course, this does not mean that they cannot be used in the relevant works. However, since as mentioned in Sec. I we only use OHROs in the present work, and hence we also have not considered these 9 extremely old globular clusters in M31 galaxy.

In Sec. III, we find that an unusually large $r_0 > 10$ Gpc (or even larger) is required to accommodate OHROs, which means that the size of the void should be much larger than the size of our observable universe (characterized by the Hubble radius/horizon $H_0^{-1} \simeq 3.0\,h^{-1}$ Gpc [123]). However, this does not make the LTB void models invalid (we thank the referee for pointing out this issue). Instead, it just means that the whole void is unobservable, or likewise that the void is a super-horizon mode perturbation. But since the variation of density inside the horizon is not negligible, such a model is physically distinct from FRW model, and hence is meaningful in principle (we thank the referee for pointing out this issue). In the present work, the age problem manifests itself mainly in the serious tension between the constraints from OHROs and other observations (e.g. SNIa, CMB and so on).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the anonymous referee for quite useful comments and suggestions, which helped us to improve this work. We are grateful to Profs. Rong-Gen Cai, Shuang Nan Zhang and Tong-Jie Zhang for helpful discussions. We also thank Hao Wang, Si-Qi Liu, as well as Zu-Cheng Chen, Jing Liu, Ya-Nan Zhou, Xiao-Bo Zou and Hong-Yu Li for kind help and discussions. This work was supported in part by NSFC under Grants No. 11175016 and No. 10905005, as well as NCET under Grant No. NCET-11-0790.

[1] A. G. Riess *et al.*, Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].
[2] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].
[3] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 175 (2003) [astro-ph/0302209].
[4] G. Hinshaw *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5226].
[5] M. Tegmark *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 103501 (2004) [astro-ph/0310723].
[6] M. Tegmark *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 123507 (2006) [astro-ph/0608632].
[7] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006) [hep-th/0603057].
[8] M. Kamionkowski, arXiv:0706.2986 [astro-ph].
[9] T. Padmanabhan, Curr. Sci. **88**, 1057 (2005) [astro-ph/0411044].
[10] S. Nobbenhuis, Found. Phys. **36**, 613 (2006) [gr-qc/0411093].
[11] V. Sahni and A. A. Starobinsky, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **9**, 373 (2000) [astro-ph/9904398].
[12] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 559 (2003) [astro-ph/0207347].
[13] A. Albrecht *et al.*, astro-ph/0609591.
[14] S. M. Carroll, AIP Conf. Proc. **743**, 16 (2005) [astro-ph/0310342].
[15] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1582 (1998) [astro-ph/9708069].
[16] P. J. Steinhardt, L. M. Wang and I. Zlatev, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 123504 (1999) [astro-ph/9812313].
[17] I. Zlatev and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Lett. B **459**, 570 (1999) [astro-ph/9906481].
[18] R. R. Caldwell, Phys. Lett. B **545**, 23 (2002) [astro-ph/9908168].
[19] R. R. Caldwell *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 071301 (2003) [astro-ph/0302506].
[20] C. Armendariz-Picon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4438 (2000) [astro-ph/0004134].
[21] C. Armendariz-Picon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 103510 (2001) [astro-ph/0006373].
[22] T. Chiba, T. Okabe and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 023511 (2000) [astro-ph/9912463].
[23] B. Feng, X. L. Wang and X. M. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **607**, 35 (2005) [astro-ph/0404224].

[24] A. Y. Kamenshchik, U. Moschella and V. Pasquier, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 265 (2001) [gr-qc/0103004].
[25] M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 043507 (2002) [gr-qc/0202064].
[26] C. Armendariz-Picon, JCAP **0407**, 007 (2004) [astro-ph/0405267].
[27] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 083002 (2006) [astro-ph/0603052].
[28] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, JCAP **0709**, 015 (2007) [astro-ph/0607064].
[29] M. Li, Phys. Lett. B **603**, 1 (2004) [hep-th/0403127].
[30] R. G. Cai, Phys. Lett. B **657**, 228 (2007) [arXiv:0707.4049].
[31] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, Phys. Lett. B **660**, 113 (2008) [arXiv:0708.0884].
[32] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, Phys. Lett. B **663**, 1 (2008) [arXiv:0708.1894].
[33] H. Wei, R. G. Cai and D. F. Zeng, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 3189 (2005) [hep-th/0501160].
[34] H. Wei and R. G. Cai, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 123507 (2005) [astro-ph/0509328].
[35] C. G. Boehmer and J. Burnett, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **25**, 101 (2010) [arXiv:0906.1351].
[36] C. G. Boehmer, J. Burnett, D. F. Mota and D. J. Shaw, JHEP **1007**, 053 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3858].
[37] H. Wei, Phys. Lett. B **695**, 307 (2011) [arXiv:1002.4230].
[38] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Rev. Rel. **13**, 3 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4928].
[39] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 451 (2010) [arXiv:0805.1726].
[40] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, Phys. Rept. **513**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2476].
[41] D. Saez-Gomez, arXiv:0812.1980 [hep-th].
[42] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B **485**, 208 (2000) [hep-th/0005016].
[43] C. Deffayet, Phys. Lett. B **502**, 199 (2001) [hep-th/0010186].
[44] C. Deffayet, G. R. Dvali and G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044023 (2002) [astro-ph/0105068].
[45] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197].
[46] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 124029 (2011) [arXiv:1008.4236].
[47] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1202**, 007 (2012) [arXiv:1110.3878].
[48] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 023518 (2007) [hep-th/0609155].
[49] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 123509 (2005) [hep-th/0504052].
[50] G. R. Bengochea and R. Ferraro, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 124019 (2009) [arXiv:0812.1205].
[51] E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 127301 (2010) [arXiv:1005.3039]; Erratum-ibid. D **82**, 109902 (2010).
[52] M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **173**, 211 (1939).
[53] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232].
[54] S. F. Hassan and R. A. Rosen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 041101 (2012) [arXiv:1106.3344].
[55] R. R. Caldwell and A. Stebbins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 191302 (2008) [arXiv:0711.3459].
[56] I. Zehavi, A. G. Riess, R. P. Kirshner and A. Dekel, Astrophys. J. **503**, 483 (1998) [astro-ph/9802252].
[57] M. N. Celerier, Astron. Astrophys. **353**, 63 (2000) [astro-ph/9907206].
[58] M. N. Celerier, astro-ph/0005594.
[59] M. N. Celerier, astro-ph/0006273.
[60] M. N. Celerier, astro-ph/0702416.
[61] R. K. Barrett and C. A. Clarkson, Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 5047 (2000) [astro-ph/9911235].
[62] K. Tomita, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **326**, 287 (2001) [astro-ph/0011484].
[63] K. Tomita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106**, 929 (2001) [astro-ph/0104141].
[64] H. Iguchi, T. Nakamura and K. i. Nakao, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108**, 809 (2002) [astro-ph/0112419].
[65] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira and K. Land, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 131302 (2008) [arXiv:0807.1443].
[66] F. K. Hansen *et al.*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **354**, 641 (2004) [astro-ph/0404206].
[67] A. K. Singal, arXiv:1305.4134 [astro-ph.CO].
[68] J. W. Moffat, JCAP **0510**, 012 (2005) [astro-ph/0502110].
[69] H. Alnes and M. Amarzguioui, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 103520 (2006) [astro-ph/0607334].
[70] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira and J. Zuntz, JCAP **0907**, 029 (2009) [arXiv:0902.1313].
[71] C. Clarkson and M. Regis, JCAP **1102**, 013 (2011) [arXiv:1007.3443].
[72] J. P. Uzan, C. Clarkson and G. F. R. Ellis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 191303 (2008) [arXiv:0801.0068].
[73] K. Bolejko and J. S. B. Wyithe, JCAP **0902**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0807.2891].
[74] S. February, C. Clarkson and R. Maartens, JCAP **1303**, 023 (2013) [arXiv:1206.1602].
[75] J. P. Zibin, A. Moss and D. Scott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 251303 (2008) [arXiv:0809.3761].
[76] K. Tomita and K. T. Inoue, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 103505 (2009) [arXiv:0903.1541].
[77] F. S. Labini and Y. V. Baryshev, JCAP **1006**, 021 (2010) [arXiv:1006.0801].
[78] P. Zhang and A. Stebbins, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 041301 (2011) [arXiv:1009.3967].
[79] W. Valkenburg *et al.*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **438**, L6 (2014) [arXiv:1209.4078].
[80] P. Bull, T. Clifton and P. G. Ferreira, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 024002 (2012) [arXiv:1108.2222].
[81] T. J. Zhang, H. Wang and C. Ma, arXiv:1210.1775 [astro-ph.CO].
[82] H. Wang and T. J. Zhang, Astrophys. J. **748**, 111 (2012) [arXiv:1111.2400].
[83] A. Meszaros, L. G. Balazs, Z. Bagoly and P. Veres, arXiv:0906.4034 [astro-ph.CO].

[84] G. Lemaître, Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles A **53**, 51 (1933);
see Gen. Rel. Grav. **29**, 641 (1997) for English translation.
[85] R. C. Tolman, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **20**, 169 (1934);
see Gen. Rel. Grav. **29**, 935 (1997) for English translation.
[86] H. Bondi, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **107**, 410 (1947).
[87] J. S. Alcaniz and J. A. S. Lima, Astrophys. J. **521**, L87 (1999) [astro-ph/9902298].
[88] M. X. Lan, M. Li, X. D. Li and S. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 023516 (2010) [arXiv:1002.0978].
[89] S. Liu and T. J. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **733**, 69 (2014) [arXiv:1311.1600].
[90] J. Dunlop *et al.*, Nature **381**, 581 (1996).
[91] H. Spinrad *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **484**, 581 (1997) [astro-ph/9702233].
[92] J. Dunlop, in *The Most Distant Radio Galaxies*, edited by H. Rottgering *et al.*, Dordrecht (1999), p. 71.
[93] G. Hasinger, N. Schartel and S. Komossa, Astrophys. J. **573**, L77 (2002) [astro-ph/0207005].
[94] S. Komossa and G. Hasinger, astro-ph/0207321.
[95] A. Friaca *et al.*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **362**, 1295 (2005) [astro-ph/0504031].
[96] J. S. Alcaniz *et al.*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **340**, L39 (2003) [astro-ph/0301226];
J. A. S. Lima and J. S. Alcaniz, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **317**, 893 (2000) [astro-ph/0005441];
D. Jain and A. Dev, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 436 (2006) [astro-ph/0509212];
J. S. Alcaniz, D. Jain and A. Dev, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 043514 (2003) [astro-ph/0210476].
[97] J. V. Cunha and R. C. Santos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **13**, 1321 (2004) [astro-ph/0402169];
J. F. Jesus, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 791 (2008) [astro-ph/0603142];
M. A. Dantas *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **467**, 421 (2007) [astro-ph/0607060];
S. Rahvar and M. S. Movahed, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 023512 (2007) [astro-ph/0604206].
[98] R. J. Yang and S. N. Zhang, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **407**, 1835 (2010) [arXiv:0905.2683].
[99] H. Wei and S. N. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 063003 (2007) [arXiv:0707.2129].
[100] Y. Zhang, H. Li, X. Wu, H. Wei and R. G. Cai, arXiv:0708.1214 [astro-ph].
[101] H. Wei, JCAP **1104**, 022 (2011) [arXiv:1012.0883].
[102] S. Wang, X. D. Li and M. Li, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 103006 (2010) [arXiv:1005.4345].
[103] S. Capozziello, P. K. S. Dunsby, E. Piedipalumbo and C. Rubano, arXiv:0706.2615 [astro-ph].
[104] M. S. Movahed, S. Baghram and S. Rahvar, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 044008 (2007) [arXiv:0705.0889].
[105] M. S. Movahed, M. Farhang and S. Rahvar, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **48**, 1203 (2009) [astro-ph/0701339].
[106] M. S. Movahed and S. Ghassemi, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 084037 (2007) [arXiv:0705.3894].
[107] N. Pires, Z. H. Zhu and J. S. Alcaniz, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 123530 (2006) [astro-ph/0606689].
[108] K. Enqvist and T. Mattsson, JCAP **0702**, 019 (2007) [astro-ph/0609120].
[109] K. Enqvist, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 451 (2008) [arXiv:0709.2044].
[110] J. Garcia-Bellido and T. Haugboelle, JCAP **0804**, 003 (2008) [arXiv:0802.1523].
[111] S. W. Goode and J. Wainwright, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 3315 (1982).
[112] A. Krasinski, *Inhomogeneous cosmological models*, Cambridge University Press (1997).
[113] M. N. Celerier, Astron. Astrophys. **543**, A71 (2012) [arXiv:1108.1373].
[114] M. N. Celerier, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **484**, 012005 (2014) [arXiv:1203.2814].
[115] H. Alnes, M. Amarzguioui and O. Gron, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 083519 (2006) [astro-ph/0512006].
[116] M. N. Celerier *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **518**, A21 (2010) [arXiv:0906.0905].
[117] R. A. Vanderveld *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 023506 (2006) [astro-ph/0602476].
[118] J. P. Zibin, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 043504 (2008) [arXiv:0804.1787].
[119] J. Silk, Astron. Astrophys. **59**, 53 (1977).
[120] A. G. Riess *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **730**, 119 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2976]; Erratum-ibid. **732**, 129 (2011).
[121] P. A. R. Ade *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A16 (2014) [arXiv:1303.5076].
[122] A. Sandage *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **653**, 843 (2006) [astro-ph/0603647].
[123] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, USA (1990).
[124] A. Stockton, M. Kellogg and S. E. Ridgway, Astrophys. J. **443**, L69 (1995).
[125] Y. Yoshii, T. Tsujimoto and K. Kawara, Astrophys. J. **507**, L113 (1998) [astro-ph/9809047].
[126] J. Ma *et al.*, Astron. J. **137**, 4884 (2009) [arXiv:0904.0553].
[127] S. Wang *et al.*, Astron. J. **139**, 1438 (2010) [arXiv:1001.3939].
[128] F. Hamann and G. Ferland, Astrophys. J. **418**, 11 (1993).
[129] M. Quartin and L. Amendola, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 043522 (2010) [arXiv:0909.4954].
[130] A. Moss, J. P. Zibin and D. Scott, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 103515 (2011) [arXiv:1007.3725].
[131] J. P. Zibin and A. Moss, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 164005 (2011) [arXiv:1105.0909].
[132] M. Ishak, A. Peel and M. A. Troxel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 251302 (2013) [arXiv:1307.0723].
[133] R. Lapiedra and J. A. Morales-Lladosa, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 064033 (2014) [arXiv:1303.1123].
[134] V. Marra and A. Notari, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 164004 (2011) [arXiv:1102.1015].
[135] V. Marra and M. Paakkonen, JCAP **1012**, 021 (2010) [arXiv:1009.4193].